UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,171	01/17/2002	Shinji Negishi	09792909-5310	3180

26263 7590 07/31/2006		

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER
STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/052,171	NEGISHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Stevens	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 May 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-86</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>28-76</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-27, 77-86</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The Office maintains the previous rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a), in light of the amendment.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed

persuasive.

Applicant asserts on pages 18-19 of the amendment that the secondary

reference, Harrington, is deficient because it does not disclose the limitation of "script

substitution". Applicant further acknowledges in the Amendment circa lines 21-22 that

"*Harrington* merely teaches that one type of script may be replaced by another." The

Applicant also asserts that an advantage that was purportedly not found in the cited

references.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with all of the allegations as argued. Examiner,

in his previous office action, gave detailed explanation of claimed limitations and pointed

out exact locations in the cited prior art.

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable

interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-1] Interpretation of

Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

The Examiner first asserts that replacing and substituting are equivalent concepts, as reflected in the dictionary definition of "substitute" as a "replacement". See The American Heritage College Dictionary, 4th Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, MA, © 2002, p. 1377. The Examiner also asserts that the advantage was not explicitly claimed, and therefore not explicitly addressed in the rejections under 35 USC §103(a). The Examiner further indicates that the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35 provides an example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification and removal of Incompatible Component (IC) JavaScript code (at column 5 lines 24-26, for example, discussing recoding of the IC). This script calling portion is represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.

Additionally, Applicant asserts on page 18 that the Examiner admitted that "Britton does not teach script substitution."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. This is a mischaracterization of the Examiner's statement. See page 4 Office Action, mailed 3/7/2006. The statement

made in the Office Action is that Britton ***does not explicitly teach*** script substitution, as
claimed. The allegation made by the Applicant is incorrect.

Applicant also asserts in lines 6-8 of page 19, that a statement made by the
examiner concerning script substitution is incorrect.

The Examiner requests further clarification to fully address Applicant's assertion.
It is unclear to which passage and to which Office Action Applicant is referring. The
Examiner is not sure of the context in which these statements were made, and therefore
unable to fully address Applicant's assertion.

Applicant asserts on pages 7-8 that motivation to combine the cited references is
lacking, arguing that the script in the Britton reference is intended to be executed on a
server, whereas the script file in the Harrington reference is intended to be executed on
a client.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees, asserting first that the references are of the
same field of endeavor, namely web-based programming. The modification of a ,
program is a software exercise. The specific hardware environment chosen for
execution of the software was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of
the invention. Therefore one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have
been motivated to apply the teachings of Harrington to Britton.

In response to applicant's argument, to combine the references, the examiner
recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the

teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

"Test of obviousness is not whether features of secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into primary reference's structure, nor whether claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of references; rather, test is what combined teachings of references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in art." In re Keller, Terry, and Davies, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

"Reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine two or more prior art references in single invention may come from references themselves, from knowledge of those skilled in art that certain references or disclosures in references are known to be of interest in particular field, or from nature of problem to be solved;" Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics Inc. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 37 USPQ2d 1626 Decided February 7, 1996 Nos. 95-1171, -1181; "[q]uestion is whether there is something in the prior art as whole to suggest desirability, and thus obviousness, of making combination." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company et al. U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 221 USPQ 481 Decided Mar. 21, 1984 No 83-1178.

For these reasons the Examiner maintains the rejections of the claims under 35

USC §103(a), as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 1-10, 12-22, 24-27 and 77-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as

being unpatentable over Britton (US Patent No. 6,591,289, filed Jul. 27, 1999 and

issued Jul. 8, 2003, hereafter referred to as "Britton") in view of Harrington et al (US

Patent No. 6,775,820, filed Nov. 29, 2000 and issued Aug. 10, 2004, hereafter referred

to as "Harrington").

Regarding independent claim 1, Britton discloses: *A conversion apparatus*

receiving a document and a script as receiving data, (See the Britton Abstract,

disclosing a client computer providing a template file, including a script, to a server.)

comprising: a memory for storing at least the script extracted from the receiving

data, the memory being located on a server configured to receive and send data

to a client; (See the Britton Abstract and Figure 3 #44 and #46, disclosing the use of

memory in the form a files and database servers. It is further inherent that the Figure 3

#42 Web Server had memory for storing the script in order to execute that script. see

also Figure 3 #48, disclosing a script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a

converted document #45c', which was sent to the client #60 in response to the client's

request #602.)

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose script substitution, as claimed.

Harrington, though, teaches *computer-readable code for substituting a script*

calling portion in the document with a portion for calling the script stored in said

memory. (See the Harrington Abstract and Figure 5 [especially #520 and #524],

disclosing a process for recoding of scripts and which discloses script conversions, such

as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. Additionally, see the Harrington reference at

column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an example of an insertion of a script calling line

into an HTML file, after identification of JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for

example]. This script calling portion is represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement

that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-

equiv" statement.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so

would have allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with

browsers running on an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These

references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based

programming.

Regarding claim 2, Britton does not explicitly disclose embedding a script in a

document, as claimed. Harrington, though, discloses: ***wherein the script is***

embedded in or attached to the document. (See the Abstract of Harrington,

discussing the embedding of JavaScript in a document.)

Regarding claim 3, Britton discloses: ***wherein the document and script are***

separately provided. (See Britton in column 7 lines 38-42, discussing separating a

document and script by having the document reference the script.)

Regarding claim 4, Britton discloses: ***wherein the conversion apparatus is a***

relay server for sending and receiving data to/from a client. (See Britton in Figure

3, showing a web server #42 for relaying data to/from client #60.)

Regarding claim 5, Britton discloses: ***wherein memory stores the document***

and the script. (See Britton in Figure 3, showing a web server #42 – it having been

implicit that such servers had memory for storing documents/scripts in order that the

servers could execute these documents/scripts.)

Claims 6-9 are directed to a method implemented by the apparatus of claims 1-3

and 5, respectively. As such, these claim are substantially similar to claims 1-3 and 5,

respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 10, Britton discloses: ***A script conversion***

system comprising a relay server for sending and receiving data to and from at

least one client, said script conversion system being used for requesting a

document and displaying the requested document by said client, (See the Britton

Abstract, discussing a client/server arrangement for providing a template file that

includes a script.) ***said relay server*** (See Britton Figure 3 #42 Web Server.)

comprising: receiving a document and a script, (See the Britton Abstract,

discussing a system for providing a template file that includes a script) ***storing the***

script in storage means, (See Britton Fig. 3, teaching the use of memory in the form of

file #44 and database #46 servers. It was also inherent that the Web server #42, would

have memory for storing the script in order to execute that script.) ***and outputting a***

resulting document as a converted document; (See Britton Fig. 3 #48, teaching a

script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c',

which is sent to the client #60 in response to client's request #602.) ***and script***

execution means for executing the script, wherein said relay server sends the

converted document to said client, and a script called by said client is executed

by said script execution means. (See Britton Fig. 3 #48, teaching a script interpreter

for executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c', which is sent to the

client #60 in response to client's request #602.)

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose script substitution, as claimed.

Harrington, though, teaches *conversion means for extracting at least the script*

from the document and the script and storing the script in storage means,

substituting a script calling portion in the document with a portion for calling the

script stored in said storage means, (See the Harrington Abstract and Figure 5

[especially #520 and #524], disclosing a process for recoding of scripts and which

discloses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script.

Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an

example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of

JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is

represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was

assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so

would have allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with

browsers running on an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These

references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based

programming.

Regarding claim 12, Britton discloses: *storing documents on servers.* (See

Britton in Figure 4, showing file server #44 having documents for a client to view, and

database server #46 containing records of past client interactions.)

Claim 13 is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 14, Britton discloses the storing and display of scripts. (See

Britton Figure 2, teaching a file server #44 and database server #46, each of which

stores files. The Examiner respectfully notes that the specific file format (e.g., HTML

document, script, etc.) of the data does not affect the storage capability of the storage

devices. See Britton Figure 2 #60, showing a browser for display.)

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose script substitution, as claimed.

Harrington, though, teaches script substitution. (See the Harrington Abstract and Figure

5 [especially #520 and #524], disclosing a process for recoding of scripts and which

discloses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script.

Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an

example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of

JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is

represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was

assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

Regarding claims 15-16, Britton discloses storing documents on multiple

servers and the display of documents. (See Britton Figure 2, teaching a file server #44

and database server #46, each of which stores files. See Britton Figure 2 #60, showing

a browser for display.)

Regarding claim 17, Britton discloses execution and display of documents.

(See Britton in Figure 3 #45c', showing the returning of a server-executed document,

and in column 8 lines 1-7, discussing sending #45c' to the client's browser.)

Regarding claim 18, Britton discloses a client authentication process. (See

Britton in Figure 4, showing a client login GUI incorporating a user ID and password. It

was implicit that if one were employing a login screen, that one was authenticating

access against a list of allowed users.)

Regarding claim 19, Britton discloses the use of a database server having, inter

alia, a list of records concerning customer/client orders. (See Britton in column 8 lines

33-54, describing an on-line ordering system. It was implicit that an ordering system

would have been tied in with a billing system, so that clients placing orders for

goods/services could also pay for those services. Britton further discloses the returning

of a server-executed document as #45c' in Fig. 3 and in col. 8 lines 1-7, which

discusses sending 45c' to the client's browser. It was also inherent that a client device

would have been capable of executing that received document, especially in light of Fig.

3 client browser #65, which was executed on client #60, and which operated on

documents such as #45c'.)

Regarding claim 20, Britton discloses accounting means. (See Britton in Figure

4 #49, showing a database server for storing database records. The records of element

#49 provide a mechanism for storing client orders, as explained in col. 9 lines 19-27.

Further, col. 9 lines 1-14 describe the updating of a customer account based on

transactions made by the customer.)

Regarding dependent claim 21, Britton discloses a server for storing

documents in advance. (See Britton Figure 3 #44, showing a file server. File servers

are well-known for storing files in advance.)

Regarding independent claim 22, Britton discloses: *A script conversion*

method for requesting from at least one client to a document server to send a

document via a relay server and displaying the requested document in said client

and for displaying the received document, (See the Britton Abstract, discussing a

client/server arrangement for providing a template file that includes a script) *receiving*

the document and a script from said document server by said relay server; (See

Britton Figure 3 #42 Web Server.) *storing the script in storage means;* (See Britton

Fig. 3, teaching the use of memory in the form of file #44 and database #46 servers. It

was also inherent that the Web server #42, would have memory for storing the script in

order to execute that script.) ***outputting a resulting document; sending the***

document to said client; (Britton further discloses in Fig. 3 #48 a script interpreter for

executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c', which is sent to the client

#60 in response to client's request #602, and subsequently displayed in a browser) ***and***

executing, on the relay server, a script in the document called by said client. (See

Britton Fig. 3 #48, teaching a script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a

converted document #45c', which is sent to the client #60 in response to client's request

#602.)

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose script conversion, extraction and

substitution, as claimed. Harrington, though, teaches ***conversion means for***

extracting at least the script from the document and the script and storing the

script in storage means, substituting a script calling portion in the document with

a portion for calling the script stored in said storage means, (See the Harrington

Abstract and Figure 5 [especially #520 and #524], disclosing a process for recoding of

scripts and which discloses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic

Script. Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which

provides an example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after

identification of JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script

calling portion is represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file

that was assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so

would have allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with

browsers running on an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These

references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based

programming.

Claim 24 is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Britton discloses storing of documents on

servers. (See Britton Figure. 2, showing a file server #44 and a database server #46.

The Examiner respectfully notes that the specific file format (e.g., HTML document,

script, etc.) of the data does not affect the storage capability of the storage devices.)

However, Britton does not explicitly teach script substitution, as claimed.

Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of scripts. (See the Harrington Abstract and

Fig. 5 elements #520 and 524, teaching that this recoding process encompasses script

conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further

taught in col. 6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code.

Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an

example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of

JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is

represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was

assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

Claim 26 is substantially similar to claim 12, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 27, Britton discloses storing of documents on multiple servers.

(See Britton Figure 2, showing a file server #44 and a database server #46. The

Examiner respectfully notes that the specific file format (e.g., HTML document, script,

etc.) of the data does not affect the storage capability of the storage devices.)

Regarding dependent claim 77, Britton discloses executing a script upon a

client request. (See Britton Figure 3 #48, showing a script interpreter.)

Regarding dependent claim 78, Britton discloses the recited limitations. (See

Britton Figure 4, showing a web server #48 for receiving a client document/request and

file server #44 and a data base server #46 for storing documents. It was well-known for

computers, such as web server #48, to provide a caching capability.)

Regarding dependent claim 79, Britton discloses sending a document to a

client. (See Britton Fig. 3 #45c'.)

However, Britton does not explicitly teach conversion and script substitution, as

claimed. Harrington, though, discloses these limitations. (See the Harrington Abstract

and Figure 5, teaching the recoding of scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the

Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been inherent at the time of the invention to

parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520 and 524, as well as the

Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script conversions,

such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col. 6

lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code. Additionally,

see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an example of an

insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of JavaScript code

[at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is represented as a

"meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL"

attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

Regarding dependent claim 80, Britton discloses sending a document to a

client. (See Britton Fig. 3 #45c'.)

However, Britton does not explicitly teach conversion and script substitution, as

claimed. Harrington, though, discloses these limitations. (See the Harrington Abstract

and Figure 5, teaching the recoding of scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the

Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been inherent at the time of the invention to

parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520 and 524, as well as the

Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script conversions,

such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col. 6

lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code. Additionally,

see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an example of an

insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of JavaScript code

[at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is represented as a

"meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL"

attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

Claims 81-82, 83-84 and 85-86 are substantially similar to claims 79-80, and

therefore likewise rejected.

5.   **Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable

over Britton (US Patent No. 6,591,289, filed Jul. 27, 1999 and issued Jul. 8, 2003,

hereafter referred to as "Britton") in view of Harrington et al (US Patent No. 6,775,820,

filed Nov. 29, 2000 and issued Aug. 10, 2004, hereafter referred to as "Harrington") and

further in view of Bickmore et al (US Patent No. 6,857,102, provisionally filed Apr. 7,

1998 and issued Feb. 15, 2005, hereafter referred to as "Bickmore").

Regarding dependent claim 11, Britton does not explicitly teach the use of

personal communication terminals, as claimed. Bickmore, though, teaches this

limitation. (See the Bickmore Abstract and col. 4 lines 45-54, disclosing the well-known

use of a personal communication terminal as a client device. The Examiner further notes that Bickmore teaches the use of scripting in col. 3 lines 29-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bickmore for the benefit of Britton in view of Harrington, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to re-author documents designed for a larger display area for display on a smaller display area, as taught by Bickmore in col. 3 lines 60-63, and would have taught a designer to employ a server to provide transformation services to conserve wireless bandwidth and device memory, as further taught by Bickmore in col. 3 lines 5-9 in the context of col. 3 lines 22-24. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Claim 23 is substantially similar to claim 11, and therefore likewise rejected.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Non-Patent Literature
<u>The American Heritage College Dictionary, 4th Edition</u>, Houghton Mifflin
Company, Boston, MA, © 2002, p. 1377.

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert Stevens
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

July 25, 2006

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER